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# Lessons from the Nile Basin Development Challenge Program: An Institutional History

[List authorship]

## Introduction: Purpose, Sources and Limitations

[half page, setting the scene. Doug can write this. Sources include document study and interviews with key people]

## Rainwater Management in the Abay River Basin: A Brief History

[>1 page maximum just for context—based on N1 report. Doug can write this]

## Challenge Program on Water and Food in the Nile: Phase 1, Basin Focal Program Outputs, and Origins of NBDC

[+/- 2.5 pages. A brief overview of what was done, and a few references as background. Doug can write this with some assistance from Don]. Then, a bit on the process of identifying the basin challenge. Was this process as flawed as in my view the Limpopo process was? Need to go back to early planning workshop proceedings and the project proposals/OLMs, etc. From interviews with Tilahun ,Alan/Katherine Deborah, maybe Seleshi?]

## The Research for Development (R4D) Concept—Evolving Understandings and Relevance

[Approx. 2 pages? This area revolves around the notion of research for development; what was the initial intention, and how did the process unfold in practice; it is based on the idea that there is a common vision and an agreed way of how to approach this, but to what extent was this true? What perceptions did various stakeholders[[1]](#footnote-1) have about R4D and its process, did they change over time, how and why, and what where the implications? Did the program adapt to changing perceptions, feedback on how we were doing, issues that arose (“Adaptive Management”)? Interviews of Tilahun, Alan, Simon, & N PLs?, and Amanda Harding?]

## Stakeholder Engagement: Approaches and Lessons

[Approx. 4-5 pages? Specify key stakeholders—target audiences. These include communities with which we worked—broadly defined, i.e. participants in IPs; local officials (kebele, woreda),regional state policy makers; federal policy makers; donors; other NGOs, planners, other researchers not involved directly in the project (Note—the OLM actually specifies this broad range).

Issues include: What was our initial intention? How did we engage with communities, and other stakeholders, and did we engage with the right people? Did we exclude people or institutions who should have been involved? What went well and less well and what did we learn from that? Did we learn quickly enough to adapt over time? Did we establish linkages with the policy engagements? Interviews Beth, Katherine, Alan, Ethiopian colleagues who have been involved in IPs?

With regard to policy makers, what was our initial intention? Did we engage at the right stages in the program, with the right levels (woreda, provincial, national) and with the right people? Did we use existing forums for policy engagement? Did we continue to engage over time, and adapt our work to policy makers’ demands? Were any linkages established among the various levels of engagement? Did we adapt to changing circumstances or to lessons learned? Interviews- Tilahun, key people in MOA and regional states, Belay, Simon, Alan, Tilahun?]

## Knowledge Management and Communication

[Approx. 2.5 pages? In a good R4D process there is an efficient and effective approach to communication, knowledge and information sharing, both internally and externally. Both internally and externally, how effective was the program in using multiple media to package and communicate results, outcomes and recommendations to diverse audiences, in triggering and documenting conversations to learn from and advance NBDC thinking and approach, in stimulating engaging work processes and events to shorten feedback loops and become more effective? What are the perceptions of different stakeholders? Is there any evidence of impacts? Interviews internally, e.g. Ewen, Peter B, Michael V; Externally, key people in MOA and regional states, Belay?]

## Evolution and Effectiveness of Partnerships and Networks

[Approx. 2-3 pages? Partners are those directly involved in the project implementation; it refers to both the individuals and the institutions. Examples are formal research partners, and implementation organizations with which we worked. How did the partnerships develop and change over time and why? What was the intention and how did this develop in practice? How committed were partners and what were the incentives to participate? Was the program effective in developing partnerships with national organizations and did the program contribute to strengthening them? Interview key representatives of partner institutions including Ethiopian research and implementation partners, complemented by Tilahun, Simon, Alan?]

## Knowledge Integration: Working Across Disciplines and Scales

[Approx. 2-3 pages? R4D is about acknowledging and valuing the diversity of member’s capabilities, capacities, resources, skills, knowledge, interests, and needs, and make use of them to integrate and co-create new knowledge and develop innovation. To what extend did this happens in practice, how, and why? Get examples, evidence. Interviews key program researchers, project leaders, including Beth/Randall, and basin leaders e.g. Tilahun, Alan and Simon]

## Innovations and Innovation Processes: Perceptions and Outcomes

[Approx. 3-4 pages? Research for development is about promoting innovation. Start with identifying what emerge from interviews and document studies as the main “innovations” produced by NBDC. What (technical, organizational, institutional, and policy) innovations did we develop, and how?

What were the understandings of this by key NBDC actors at the outset of the program, and how did these understandings evolve (if they did)? Did everyone have a shared understanding and was this explicitly developed? What is the role of research in the innovation process? What made it work or not work? Did innovations emerge from knowledge integration across disciplines or were these largely within disciplines? Interviews Tilahun, Simon, Alan, researchers, Belay, & key people in MOA and regional states? Latter may not know, which will be indicative in itself]

## Assessment of NBDC Theory of Change

[Approx. 2-2.5 pages? Within R4D, there is an appreciation for learning by doing and M&E. What was the theory of change (and other planning/monitoring tools and approaches used) and how did it guide our work? How was it intended and implemented in practice? And if it did not guide our work, what did? Did our theory of change evolve with experience? To what extent do stakeholders think that we achieved the outcomes? Were there any unintended effects/outcomes? Did we practice adaptive management throughout the program, and if not why not? What were the implications of this? Interviews with broad range of research leaders, BLs?].

## Retrospective Assessment: Key Gaps and Limitations

[2-3 pages. I added this to capture issues not covered above. Gender will be a major gap to be discussed. We could evaluate the extent to which the program was successful in adaptive management [involving Belay and me is an example of adaptive management, I guess!]; other issues may include personnel changes; the structure imposed by CPWF with separate projects and a dis-empowered BL [I know Limpopo will have something to say on this]; overly ambitious design given limited resources and time; and any others that emerge from the interviews and documents.]

## Looking Forward: Building on the NBDC Legacy

[+/- 1-1.5 pages. Brief summary of 2-3 main lessons, innovations providing foundation; links to Sunrise Strategy, next steps; has NBDC bent the SLWM trajectory in the Blue Nile?]

## References

**Revised Time planning**

| **Tasks** | **Week** | **Who** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * Outline and interview schedules produced | 19 April | Kees, Doug, Ewen |
| * Feedback from others | 24 April | Simon, Alan, Amanda |
| * Kees to work with Doug on inventory of key documents | 19-24 April | Kees to take lead and share/discuss with Doug |
| * Document review | 15-30 April (3 weeks) | Doug mainly |
| * Conduct as many interviews as is and share transcripts with Doug | 22 April into May | Ewen & Kees to the extent possible—time available is limited |
| * Integrate feedback from interviews & documents to act as raw material for Basin Leader peer assist discussion in Lima in June | 29 May | Doug will have limited time but can contribute; may need Ewen, Kees to work on this as well |
| * Basin leader peer assist in Lima Peru where raw material is being used as input. | 3-8 June | Alan, Amanda? |
| * Complete interviews, etc. | June | Kees, Ewen |
| * Integrate feedback into draft final report\*. This includes using any feedback from Lima | 20 July | Doug, in discussion with Kees, Ewen. (Doug can spend a few extra days before/after science workshop on this in Addis) |
| * Final feedback and integration – final report | Early August | Doug integrates feedback from Alan, Simon and Amanda |

\*Intention is to transform report into a R4D publication led by Kees in 2nd half of the year

1. Although I refer to stakeholders, it would be more correct to refer to key persons across different disciplines and/or organizations; the emphasis is not on different stakeholders’ perspectives, but getting a better idea of what has happened in the Nile BDC. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)